

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 are cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer

Claims 4-31 are pending and under consideration.

The Examiner indicates that claims 18-23 are allowed. (Action at page 7). Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter.

The Office Action Summary of the current Office Action mailed August 12, 2004 indicates in block 4 that claims 1-21 are pending. Applicant respectfully submits that this entry is in error as claims 1-31 were pending as filed September 26, 2003. The current Office Action, for example, indicates in block 5 that claims 18-23 are allowed and in block 6 that claims 24-31 are rejected. Applicant requests replacement of the Office Action Summary sheet acknowledging that claims 4-31 are currently pending.

In addition, the Examiner has not indicated acceptance of the drawings filed with the application on September 26, 2003. Applicant requests a replacement Office Action Summary sheet be provided with blocks 10) and 10a) checked and acknowledging acceptance of the drawings by the Examiner.

Also, Applicant brings to the attention of the Examiner that in the Detailed Action of the current Office Action, item 1 indicates that "(c)laims 1-6 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bilich et al. (US 5,877,483) in view of Huang et al. (US 2003/0126483)." (Action at page 2). Block 6 of the Office Action summary indicates that claims 1-17 and 24-31 are rejected. The Examiner discusses the rejections of claims 7-9, 14-17 and 24-31 on pages 3-6 of the current Office Action, but does not specify the specific grounds of rejection. This response is fully responsive to the rejections assuming that the Examiner is also rejecting claims 7-9, 14-17 and 24-3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bilich in view of Huang.

All rejections are traversed.

According to an aspect of the present invention, a monitor is connected to a system and displays a signal generated by the system. The monitor includes an interface allowing information to be input to, and output from, a smart card containing personal identification information, and a detector determining insertion of the smart card into the monitor. A controller reads the personal identification information from the smart card and controls a turning on, or off, of the display of the monitor based on the read result, when the presence of the smart card is

recognized by the detector. Thus, energy usage of the monitor is decreased, user actions are decreased, and longevity of the monitor life is increased.

Bilich teaches (See, for example, cols. 1-2, starting at line 64) a system implemented in a PC including a power supply, a CPU and a card reader reading data encoded on user identification cards swiped through the reader and determining whether the user is authorized to access the PC. If the user is not authorized, the PC remains powered down, and if determined user authorized, the PC is powered up.

Huang teaches (See, for example paragraph 0023) a starter for a computer system including an interface generating an enable signal when an IC card is inserted, a register set storing a command provided to the IC card and detecting whether a user check signal matches a computer check signal, a state machine reading the user check signal and a power control circuit generating a Power On signal to a power supply of the computer system in response to the check signal.

An *arguendo* combination of Bilich and Huang teaches a system in a PC including a power supply, a CPU and a card reader reading data encoded on user identification cards. If the user is not authorized, the PC remains powered down, and if determined user authorized, the PC is powered up, and including a starter including an interface generating an enable signal when a card is inserted, a register set storing a command provided to the IC card and detecting whether a user check signal matches a computer check signal, a state machine reading the user check signal and a power control circuit generating a Power On signal to a power supply of the computer in response to the check signal.

ITEM 1, PAGES 3-4: REJECTION OF INDEPENDENT CLAIM 4 (AND DEPENDENT CLAIMS 5-10) UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER BILICH IN VIEW OF HUANG

Independent claim 4 recites a monitor including "a detector detecting a signal through the interface; determining insertion of the smart card into the monitor; and a controller reading the personal identification information via the interface from the smart card, and controlling turning a display of the monitor on or off, when the insertion of the smart card is detected."

The Action concedes that Bilich does not teach "an actual display unit reading the card." (Action at page 2). The Examiner contends that "Re claim 4-6, . . . it is well known that computer systems include controllers/processors, which control the systems operation. . . Such means are well known to produce expected results, and are therefore obvious." (Action at page 4).

Applicant submits that it is understood in the art that a CPU reading a card as taught by Bilich does not teach a monitor reading a card. Applicant respectfully submits that the

Examiner's contentions are unsupported taking of official notice. As understood in the art, such modifications can require circuit and software redesign and are not obvious. As set forth in MPEP §2144.03 entitled Taking of Official Notice Is Unsupported:

It would not be appropriate for the examiner to take official notice of facts without citing a prior art reference where the facts asserted to be well known are not capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known. For example, assertions of technical facts . . . must always be supported by citation to some reference work recognized as standard in the pertinent art.

Further, Applicant submits features of the dependent claims are not taught or suggested by the cited art, for example, dependent claim 7 recites a monitor "wherein the controller registers personal identification information stored in the smart card or deletes the registered personal identification information." The Action concedes that the feature is not taught by the cited art. However, the Examiner contends that the feature is obvious in ... "it is well known and conventional to delete records, for example when users leave a bank or leave a system and their accounts are to be deactivated." While *arguendo* it may be conventional to delete records when "users leave a bank," this does not teach features of a controller registering or deleting the registration of information stored in a smart card.

In addition, dependent claims 7 recites a monitor "further comprising a storage unit storing the personal identification information from the smart card during the registering." The Examiner contends " it is well known and conventional to store smart card data from a card when comparing it to data on the system." Applicant submits that such contentions are an unsupported taking of official notice by the Examiner.

Conclusion

Since features of independent claim 4 (and dependent claims 5-10) are not taught by the cited art and the Examiner's contentions are unsupported, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 4-10 allowed.

ITEM 1, PAGES 4-7: REJECTION OF INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 11, 16, 26, AND 30 (AND RESPECTIVE DEPENDENT CLAIMS 12-15, CLAIM 17, CLAIMS 27-29, AND CLAIM 31) UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER BILICH IN VIEW OF HUANG

Independent claim 11 recites a method of turning "a display of a monitor on or off connected to a system, including checking the insertion of a smart card into the monitor; turning a display of the monitor off when the smart card is not inserted into the monitor, after a predetermined time; reading personal identification information from the smart card when the smart card is inserted into the monitor; turning the display of the monitor on if the personal identification information correlates to an authenticated user; and turning the display of the

monitor off if the personal identification information does not correlate to the authenticated user." (Emphasis added).

Independent claim 16 recites a method including "registering information stored in a smart card to a storage unit of the monitor; (and) checking the insertion of the smart card into the monitor through a smart card interface on the monitor."

Independent claim 26 recites a computer-readable medium implementing a method "checking the insertion of a smart card into the monitor; turning a display of the monitor off when the smart card is not inserted into the monitor." Independent claim 30 recites a computer-readable medium implementing a method including registering information stored in a smart card to a storage unit of the monitor; checking the insertion of the smart card into the monitor through a smart card interface on the monitor."

The Action concedes that Bilich does not teach "an actual display unit reading the card." (Action at page 2). The Examiner contends "the state machine 21 (Huang et al.) to include a monitor microcomputer." The Examiner further contends the recited features are obvious, but does not provide any reference to support the contentions.

Applicant submits that the cited art, alone or in combination, do not teach features, for example, of "turning the display of the monitor on if the personal identification information correlates to an authenticated user." Bilich teaches (cols. 1-2, starting at line 64) only that a CPU and a card reader are powered up. Applicant submits that Huang teaches a computer starter, and does not teach or suggest a monitor.

Applicant further submits that the contentions of the Examiner are unsupported taking of official notice as set forth by MPEP §2144.03.

Further, dependent claims recite features not taught by the cited art alone or in combination. For example, dependent claim 12 recites "supplying power to the smart card prior to reading information therefrom, when the presence of the smart card is detected." Dependent claim 14 recites a method including "registering comprising: reading of the personal identification information from the smart card and, and storing information in the storage unit for the authentication of the personal identification information."

Conclusion

Since features of independent claims 11, 16, 26, and 30 (and respective dependent claims 12-15, claim 17, claims 27-29, and claim 31) are not taught by the cited art, and the Examiner's contentions are unsupported, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 11-17 and 24-31 allowed.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: November 12, 2004

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501